

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #248
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 23 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 248

Today's Topics:

 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
 Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new?
 PRB-1 and the ARRL

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 93 10:01:48 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:
: In article <1993Jul21.014331.966@cyphyn.UUCP> randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:
: >
: >Excuse me! Can I point out something everyone seems to be overlooking?
: >
: >Not everyone is overlooking your point....
: >
: > It is not hazing.....the tests are to find out if or not one knows what
: >they are doing, to try and make sure that responsible people are going to
: >be at the controls.
: >
: The tests are not intended to find out if generally responsible people
: are at the controls. The tests are an effort to certify that an amateur
: radio operator is sufficiently knowledgeable to be trusted to build, adjust
: and operate radio equipment in conformance with Part 97. Part 97 goes

: on to state that the purpose and goals of the amateur radio service. One
: of the goals of the amateur radio service, according to Part 97, is to
: provide a pool of trained radio operators. When the amateur radio service

In other words a responsible person...and you've detailed what those
responsibilities are.

We agree (I do, with you at least)

: as we know it today was invented, one of the attributes of a useful radio
: operator was the knowledge of CW, therefore radio amateurs were required
: to learn CW. CW also became entrenched in an international treaty.

:

: > Back in '33 one had to know how to dip the plate (NO! it is not a
: >procedure used in a restaurant), or there would be some serious problems.
: > Back in '33 the 2 major modes of transmission were CW and AM...so, one
: >had to know how to operate their rigs accordingly, and the tests were to
: >find out if you did or not.
: > Now, with all these new sets, that auto-tune, and all kinds of transmission
: >modes....most fully automatic...all one does is push the SEND button...
: >it's not so great a concern about how one runs their rig, but how they will
: >communicate over it.

:

: Nonetheless, you are still permitted to build and adjust radio equipment,
: even though it is easier than it once was.

True, but, entry level exams don't need to focus on that...maybe a bit
more on what is being transmitted?

:

: > However, the tests are not quite 'right' and so instead of being a means
: >to insure one knows what they are doing, well.....

:

: The tests still focus on the most salient issues in front of ham radio
: today; the rules, regulations and technical standards. Even though radios
: are easier to operate, there are a great many regulations to know. Sure,
: the tests don't focus on "how do you build a radio?"; this is not as salient
: to the goals of Part 97 as it once was.

I agree with that all the way...but the tests I took seemed only to just
'touch' upon....well what I might call 'proper use of the radio' :

: > It has ended up being a last defence against letting in all kinds of
: >people who'd use it like how C/B is being used....miserably adjusted rigs,
: >radio-terrorism (intentional QRM), a podium to air ones hate and dislikes
: >(practically broadcasting) of some of the most-to-be-avoided topics there
: >are, generally carefree and disregarding everything but what THEY want.

: >

: > That is not wanted , that's not what Ham radio is for, and people are seeing

: >such stuff creep in, and are concerned!
:
: These last two paragraphs are more of an opinion than observation of fact.

Well! lets just say I should certainly hope that is not wanted!

And please dont tell me Ham radio IS for people to do as typed above
And as to "...people are seeing..." I speak of some guys I USED to be able
to QSO...who have no access here. They have seen it creep in...it drove us
out!

:
: > So, the test , has ended up being a sort of hurdle, with maybe this idea:
: >If they can't put in the time /effort to learn a little CW and some very
: >basic theory, then they are not serious about being responsible people, and
: >so they may be best to get a 27mc radio.

:
: The test is still trying to accomplish the goals of Part 97. The focus is
: on rules, regs and technical standards, though the Advanced test is rather
: theory focused. The issue is not about being generally responsible and
: disciplined enough to learn CW; the issue is being responsible about operating
: a radio.

:
YES 'operating the radio ' is what I am talking about. But CW is maybe being
used as one of the ways to filter out those who'd treat Ham radio as c/b #2
sence such poeple are less likly to want to study that much.

: > I would like to see the tests reflect more of what is really needed:
:
: [other stuff deleted... mostly motherhood..]

thank you.

:
: > So same for ... well lets say CW....To be authorized to use CW, one must
: >be able to send and receive it , readably. (I hear some cheers somewhere)
:
: The tests already reflect this; to use CW, one must be able to send and
: receive it, readably. If one cannot send and receive CW, then one cannot
: use CW. Other than the international treaty, I see no reason whatsoever
: to require a test of CW skill. If a person wants to use CW, they will.
: If a person is not interested in CW and does not learn it, they will not
: use CW. Is this so bad?

No, not bad at all....but have you heard some of the CW I have?
...well maybe not....

:
: >Does anyone have any idea just what kind of Pandora's box would be opened
: >if both CW and theory tests were done away with????
: >1912 Bedlam!

:
: Who had proposed doing away with all tests? As a "CW reformist", I support
: abolishing the 13 and 20 WPM tests, possibly replacing them with extended
: written tests intended as a test of skill. A compromise I would accept
: is offering one the choice of CW or written skill test.

:
Perhaps I misread...theres a lot of stuff back there...and all this I'm say-
ing is not JUST to you...Are you the only one who's seeing my posts??
SOMEbody back there wanted to see just about everything abolished.
Obviously it's not you, and my focus (attempt!) is on the entry levels
of Tech and Tech+.

: When the international treaty requiring knowledge of CW for amateurs below
: 30 Mhz is changed to delete this requirement, I will ask that the 5 WPM
: test be abolished or replaced with a test of skill.

:
: These written tests of skill would require one to calculate and write, and
: would not have multiple choice questions. These tests would test skills
: salient to radio today, such as computer programming ;-).

With hollerinth cards, and toggle switch loading? heh heh. :)

:
: --
: * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are
: *
: * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily
: *
: * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
: *

>>>* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

In view of the awful time I've been having getting past around , I think
9 wpm, I would not stand in your way about that.

But, as it was CW that drew me to Ham radio, thats why I didn't gripe
over having to do the CW test...and why I would wait til I was ABLE to
run what ever WPM is required, rather than do else wise...

But, sence, I have liecence enough to do all I would ever have time to
do...I likly won't look hard to upgrade....but then there's 160m , a
band I always considered to be the best....so, who knows!

73's

--

Randy,KA1UNW

If you get a shock while servicing your equipment

DON'T JUMP! You might break an expensive tube.

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 12:34:04 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!
bodoh@ames.arpa
Subject: Policy of Reverse Autopatches, anything new?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22kctaINN6ua@bashful.isi.com>, jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323) writes:
|> In article <morgdw.2.743277046@saturn.wwc.edu> morgdw@saturn.wwc.edu (DWIGHT CLINTON MORGAN) writes:
|> >Have been off the net for awhile, has any new policies been released on
|> >reverse autopatches? Thanks.
|>
|>
|> Specifically, can one order pizza using a reverse autopatch? :-)
|>
|> --
|> Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
--

Only if your Pizza Patrol is on the air and can copy the required 20 WPM code! Hopefully their 300' tower has been approved by the zoning board.

++++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0X?? (in the mail) +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
++++++

Date: 22 Jul 93 16:11:55 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: PRB-1 and the ARRL
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:
>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little)
>writes:
>
>>Tell me where to write. I'm warming up the PC now...

>
>The Directors are listed on page 8 of any recent QST. A list is
>also available on our ARRL Automated Electronic Mail Server, info@arrl.org .
>The file name is: ARRL-DIRECTORS.

I dunno, Ed. You've led them to water, but can you make them drink?

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 22:42:35 GMT
From: agate!linus!linus.mitre.org!wralston.mitre.org!user@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22i5vt\$9k6@techbook.techbook.com>, <CAIpCC.MsL@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>,
<1993Jul21.153450.28504@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>7
Subject : Re: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

In article <1993Jul21.153450.28504@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov
(Tom Bodoh) wrote:

>
> In article <CAIpCC.MsL@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>, Kenneth.E.Harker@Dartmouth.Edu
(Kenneth E. Harker) writes:
> |> In article <22i5vt\$9k6@techbook.techbook.com>
> |> genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Wolford) writes:
> |>
> |> > I called the ARRL VE info number, 1-800-9ARRLVE.
[found out it took the ARRL 17-19 to forward his paperwork to FCC]
> |>
> |> I just called this number myself to find that my paperwork didn't leave
> |> ARRL hands until 18 days after I had taken my test.
[snip]
> I too am awaiting my license and would like to hear from the ARRL their
> side of this discussion... story!
[snip]
> ARRL - what's the real scoop? Please answer here rather than email - it
> seems that inquiring minds want to know...

rant mode on

Me too - what's the ARRL's problem? Especially given all the money the
league spends recruiting new hams, to be some lame in actually getting them
licensed. This really frosts me, especially considering the following,
excerpted from ARRL Bulletin 75, July 18, 1993...

Now, I've already got my license, but I personally am willing to wait a couple more weeks for my DXCC certificate so some folks can get their licenses processed in a timely manner. ARRL get your act together!!

-- Bill wtr@mitre.org AI6E

From: butch!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!
dana@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

<1993Jul19.190838.5804@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>,
<1993Jul21.152340.22019@midway.uchicago.edu>land
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

>In article <1993Jul19.190838.5804@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>
kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com

```
>  
>:Talk about embarrassing phonetics, my call (about 8 months old now) is  
>:KN6FQ.  You don't even need phonetics to make that one sound obscene  
>:over the air!  I wouldn't trade it for anything.
```

```
>
>Kevin, send in a form 610 form requesting a new call sign, attach a
```

Did I miss something here?

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *

* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *

* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer

*

* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 10:27:09 GMT

From: europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAHCHC.C71@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com>, <22kbdiINN6ta@bashful.isi.com>D

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22kbdiINN6ta@bashful.isi.com> jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323) writes:

>

>However, I don't think there is anything wrong with those who argue that
>entry barriers are necessary. This is not the same thing as bigotry.

Sure Mr. Gardner, we'll allow you to vote after you pass this simple little literacy test. Now name all the stars in the galaxy, and don't you forget Belafonte. :-)

The Supremes have outlawed job testing that contains questions that aren't pertinent to the main skills required to perform the job. Since Morse operation is now a minor part of amateur radio, like other specialty operating modes such as ATV, RTTY, AMTOR, etc, it's continued testing as a separate element that determines your entire pass fail chance for a particular license class, is excessive. Make your score on the Morse test 10-20% of your *total* score, like other specialty modes are, and there wouldn't be any complaints.

Entry barriers, like college entrance exams, may be necessary, but they should be *relevant* and *proportionate* as well.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 10:12:18 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!

gary@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>,
<POPOVICH.93Jul20145616@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>, <22kag8INN6se@bashful.isi.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22kag8INN6se@bashful.isi.com> jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323) writes:

>In article <POPOVICH.93Jul20145616@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>

popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com (Steve Popovich) writes:

>>>So if "theory" doesn't have anything to do with operating competency, why
>>>require it? If the code test is hazing, then so is the theory test.

>>

>>Because ham radio licensees are allowed to build and repair their own
>>equipment, and the theory is important for that privilege. Of course,
>>what they test is pretty minimal, and it's easy to argue that perhaps
>>a tougher theory test should be required in order to homebrew

>

>This is a well-thought-out response and I'm almost inclined to go along
>with it, but for one thing... How many "average" hams can build or
>repair an average modern ham rig given the amount of theory they learn
>for the exam? Many learn nothing at all; they simply memorize the question
>pool or guess at the answers (that's why the test is jokingly referred to
>as multiple-guess). And how many hams today build their own gear? I'll
>bet not one in 500.

Well we can turn this around. How many graduate EEs can repair a ham
rig, or a toaster. The answer may shock you. :-)

Theory is fine, and useful, but it's not sufficient to make a competent
repairman. That takes **experience**, something you're expected to get
after you pass the exams. Amateur radio is supposed to be a lifelong
learning experience, you only take the exam once, at the beginning of
your education. Think of it as a minimal **entrance** exam that shows you
are prepared with the basic skills needed to **learn** about electronics
and radio, not a graduate degree showing competence in the field.

>And given that modern rigs are crammed with surface-mount components,
>highly integrated ICs, and enough software to choke a Cray, even a ham
>who did learn some theory along the way has almost no hope of being
>able to repair these rigs.

Nonsense. The factory techs aren't likely to be graduate EEs either,
they just have more experience than some hams at working on particular
pieces of equipment. You can get that experience too, by **doing**, not
by taking tests. Surface mount components are **easier** to work with

than thruhole components, you just need the minimal right tools and a bit of experience in using them. Firmware for which you don't have a functional spec *can* make your job harder in some ways, but a buss is a buss, and TTL levels are TTL levels. A scope and some minimal brainpower can trace out 99.99% of all radio problems. Besides, most problems are obvious, it's that big charred spot where the trouble lies. :-)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #248
